



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/675,620	09/29/2000	Daniel Rodman Hicks	ROC920000200	9570	
75	90 12/17/2003		EXAMINER		
Gero G. McClellan Thomason, Moser & Patterson, L.L.P. 3040 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 1500			KISS, ERIC B		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Houston, TX	•		2122	~~	
			DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003	/	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1944			
	Application No	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/675,620	HICKS, DANIEL RODMAN				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Eric B. Kiss	2122				
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	ed amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	ut(s) a) will not be entered or to work and will not be entered or to work and will not be rejected is provided be	) will be entered low or appended.	<del>l and</del> an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 22 and 25-28	··					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21, 23, and 24						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. $\boxtimes$ The drawing correction filed on <u>24 November 2003</u> is a) $\square$ approved or b) $\boxtimes$ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10. Other: See Continuation Sheet						

( ) 🛶

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection of claims 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,805,899 (EVANS et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,298,478 (NALLY et al.).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant's cited portion of the specification does not appear to provide any formal lexicon for "inter-compilation version conflicts" or "inter-compilation module calls" and therefore, does not provide a compelling reason why the Examiner's interpretation of these terms, as applied in the rejection of claims 1-21, 23, and 24, is precluded by Applicant's specification.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Examiner notes that the replacement drawings appear to overcome the remaining objections to the drawings as detailed in the previous office actions (Paper Nos. 2 and 4). However, the replacement drawings fail to comply with the requirements set forth in 37 CFR 1.121 which states that any replacement drawing sheet must be identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" (see revised 37 CFR 1.121; effective date: July 30, 2003).

TUAN DAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER